

REMARKS

I. Introduction

With the cancellation herein without prejudice of claim 26, claims 13 to 26 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the indication that all copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received from the International Bureau.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 paper and cited references.

II. Objections to the Drawings

As regards the objections to the drawings, while the objections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters a replacement drawing sheet (Figure 4) including an illustration of a secondary winding arrangement arranged at a lower side of a floor of a vehicle is being submitted to address this objection. Furthermore, while 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) requires the drawings to show every feature of the specified in the claims, "conventional features disclosed in the description and claims . . . should be" -- but are not required to be -- "illustrated in the drawing" "where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention." In the case of the features mentioned in paragraph 1 of the Office Action, a detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, no further drawings are believed to be required.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 19 to 24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 19 to 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. The definiteness requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is satisfied if the claims set out and circumscribe a particular subject matter with a reasonable degree of clarity and particularity. The present claims are sufficient in this regard. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejections is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 13 to 15 and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 13 to 15 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,369,685 (“Milavec et al.”). While Applicants do not agree with the merits of this rejection, to facilitate matters, claims 14 and 26 have been cancelled. It is respectfully submitted that Milavec does not anticipate claims 13 and 15 as amended herein for at least the following reasons.

As an initial matter, the Examiner will note that claim 13 as amended, for example, recites that a flat winding disposed about one limb of an E-shaped geometry of a ferrite core is arranged as conductor track sections on a multilayer board having a plurality of planar layers and the flat winding changes to another planar layer of the multilayer board after each conductor track section. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 3, lines 27 to 28 and page 7, lines 9 to 22 of the Specification and in Figures 1a and 1b. With this arrangement for the winding, the current conduction runs not only in a single, spiral, specific plane, but rather the conduction changes repeatedly between the planes to reduce a skin effect.

Referring to the Figures 1 to 4 of Milavec, it is plainly apparent that Milavec does not disclose, or even suggest, that a flat winding disposed about one limb of an E-shaped geometry of a ferrite core is arranged as conductor track sections on a multilayer board having a plurality of planar layers and the flat winding changes to another planar layer of the multilayer board after each conductor track section. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Milavec does not anticipate claims 13 and 15.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 16 and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Milavec and U.S. Patent No. 6,466,454 (“Jitaru”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Milavec and Jitaru does not render unpatentable claims 16 and 17 for at least the following reasons.

Claims 16 and 17 ultimately depend from claim 13 and therefore include all of the features included in claim 13. As more fully set forth above, Milavec does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 13.

Jitaru does not cure the critical deficiencies of Milavec. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Milavec and Jitaru does not render unpatentable claim 13 or claims 16 and 17, which ultimately depend from claim 13.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claim 18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Milavec and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0036561 (“Jedlitschka”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Milavec and Jedlitschka does not render unpatentable claim 18 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 18 depends from claim 13 and therefore includes all of the features included in claim 13. As more fully set forth above, Milavec does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 13. Jedlitschka does not cure the critical deficiencies of Milavec. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Milavec and Jedlitschka does not render unpatentable claim 13 or claim 18, which depends from claim 13.

VII. Rejection of Claims 13 to 15 and 19 to 26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 13 to 15 and 19 to 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,407,470 (“Seelig”) and Milavec. While Applicants do not agree with the merits of this rejection, to facilitate matters, claims 14 and 26 have been cancelled. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Seelig and Milavec does not render unpatentable claims 13, 15 and 19 to 25 as amended herein for at least the following reasons.

As more fully set forth above, Milavec does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 13. Seelig does not cure the critical deficiencies of Milavec. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Seelig and Milavec does not render unpatentable claim 13 or claim 15, which depends from claim 13.

Claim 19 includes features analogous to those of claim 13 and is therefore allowable for substantially the same reasons more fully set forth above. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Seelig and Milavec does not render unpatentable claim 19 or claims 20 to 25, which depend from claim 19.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VIII. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 16, 2008

By: /  /

Clifford A. Ulrich
Reg. No. 42,194

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646